

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the references cited in Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement of October 20, 2003 have been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 10, 15 and 17-21 have been cancelled without prejudice or waiver. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification has been objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter previously recited in independent claim 12.

Claim 12 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns and to more clearly define the invention. In view of the amendment of claim 12, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejection under 35 USC §101

Claims 7-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claims 10, 15 and 17-21

These claims have been cancelled, so their rejection hereunder is moot.

Claim 7

Independent claim 7 has been amended to alleviate the Examiner's concerns and to more clearly define the invention. As amended, Applicant submits that claim 7 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7, and

claims 8, 9 and 11 which depend therefrom, are directed to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 12

Independent claim 12 has been amended to alleviate the Examiner's concerns and to more clearly define the invention. As amended, Applicant submits that claim 12 is directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 12, and claims 13, 14 and 16 which depend therefrom, are directed to patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101, and requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 USC §112

Dependent claims 5, 11, 16 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 5 has been amended to alleviate the Examiner's concerns and to more clearly define the invention. In view of the amendment to this claim, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of this claim.

Claims 11 and 16 do not include the same feature previously recited by dependent claim 5. These claims include a feature of "wherein the sending of the request, from the remote computer to the address issuing computer, for an address for the remote computer is prompted by the remote computer being powered on," which feature was not previously recited in claim 5. (Emphasis added) With this "powered on" feature in claims 11 and 16, there is no problem in regard to these claims of the recited remote computer possibly being in a "constant loop", which was noted by the Examiner in regard to claim 5. Therefore, for at least the forgoing reasons, Applicant traverses this rejection of claims 11 and 16 and requests withdrawal of the rejection of same.

Claim 21 has been cancelled, so its rejection is moot.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0165056 A1 to Komaki (hereinafter "Komaki"). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the invention.

Komaki is directed to a system and method where network terminal devices and an address management server can communicate with a remote terminal without manually managing the IP address of the remote terminal. (See, for example, the Abstract of Komaki) Komaki describes in more detail that a network device 2a-d, an address management server 5, a DHCP server 4 and a DNS server 3 are connected via a network 1. (See, for example, Fig. 1 and Pars. [0026]-[0027] of Komaki) When connected to the network 1, a network device 2a-d broadcasts a request for an IP address, which request is served by the DHCP server 4 which provides the requesting network device 2a-d with an IP address. (See, for example, Para. [0033] 2 of Komaki) As described in Para. [0033] of Komaki, cited by the Examiner on page 6 of the Office Action, an IP address of the DHCP server 4 and the IP address of the address management server 5 are stored in an address table 16a in storage portion 16 of a network device 2a-d, however address management server 5 does not know the IP address of the network device 2a-d received from the DHCP server 4. (See also, Figs. 1 and 2 of Komaki)

Furthermore, Komaki does not disclose that the DHCP server 4 has data which includes the IP address of the management server 5. Additionally, Komaki does not describe a network device 2a-d receives from the DHCP server 4 the IP address of the management server 5 in addition to the IP address for itself which it requested. Furthermore, Komaki does not disclose that the network device 2a-d uses the IP address of the management server to provide the management server with the IP address of the network device 2a-d which it received from the DHCP server 4.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Komaki does not disclose, among other things, a method for providing an address of a remote computer to a management computer including:

"receiving in an internet protocol (IP) address issuing computer Option data from a management computer, the Option data comprising:

an identification of and authorization for a remote computer to request an IP address from the IP address issuing computer, and
an IP address of the management computer;
sending a request from the remote computer to the address issuing computer for an IP address;

receiving at the remote computer the requested IP address from the IP address issuing computer and the IP address of the management computer of the Option data; and

executing a local code in the remote computer such that the local code in the remote computer is responsive to the IP address of the management computer of the Option data and utilizes the received IP address of the management computer to direct the remote computer to automatically provide the received requested IP address of the remote computer to the management computer," as currently recited in claim 1. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 7

Independent claim 7 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, Komaki does not disclose, among other things, a system for providing an address of a remote computer to a management computer, wherein

"the management computer is configured to send Option data from the management computer to the IP address issuing computer, the Option data comprising:

an identification of and authorization for the remote computer to request an IP address from the IP address issuing computer, and
an IP address of the management computer;
the remote computer sends a request to the IP address issuing computer for an IP address;

the remote computer receives the requested IP address from the IP address issuing computer and IP address of the management computer of the Option data; and

a local code in the remote computer being responsive to the IP address of the management computer of the Option data utilizes the received IP address of the management

computer to direct the remote computer to provide the received requested IP address of the remote computer to the management computer," as currently recited in claim 7. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 7 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 7 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 12

Independent claim 12 has been amended to more clearly define the invention. For at least the reasons given above in regard to amended independent claim 1, Komaki does not disclose, among other things, a computer program product for providing an internet protocol (IP) address of a remote computer to a management computer, including:

"sending Option data from a management computer to an IP address issuing computer, the Option data comprising:

an identification of and authorization for a remote computer to request an IP address from the address issuing computer, and

an IP address of the management computer;

sending a request from the remote computer to the address issuing computer for an IP address;

receiving at the remote computer the requested IP address from the IP address issuing computer and the IP address of the management computer of the Option data; and

executing a local code in the remote computer such that the local code in the remote computer is responsive to the IP address of the management computer of the Option data and utilizes the received IP address of the management computer to direct the remote computer to provide the received requested IP address of the remote computer to the management computer," as currently recited in claim 12.

Claim 12 is directed to a computer program product, however Komaki does not disclose a computer program product to accomplish the above-listed features recited in amended claim 12.

Thus, independent claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over Komaki, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn, and allowance of claim 12

is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-16 and 18-21

Regarding claims 4, 10, 15 and 17-21, since these claims have been cancelled their rejection is moot.

Regarding dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16, since these claims depend from amended independent claim 1, 7 or 12, they include all of the features of the independent claim from which they respectively depend, as described above. For at least the reasons given above regarding independent claims 1, 7 and 12, Komaki does not disclose all the features of these dependent claims. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 are patentably distinguishable over Komaki, and accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14 and 16 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Serial No.: 10/689,432
Docket No.: RPS920030021US1
Reply to the Office Action of May 21, 2008

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: August 19, 2008
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: Joseph W. King
Joseph W. King
Registration No. 35, 768